

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Eric Alan Sanders,

Plaintiff,

v.

Family Dollar Stores of South Carolina LLC;
Dollar Tree Inc.; and Maurita G. Kamer,

Defendants.

C/A No. 1:24-6854-SAL

ORDER

Plaintiff Eric Alan Sanders (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this employment action in the United States District Court in the Eastern District of Virginia in August 2023. *See* ECF No. 1. The case was transferred to this court in November 2024. *See* ECF No. 23 at 1. A review of the docket in the Eastern District of Virginia reveals the court order transferring the case was returned to that court as undeliverable. *See Sanders v. Family Dollar*, 2:23-cv-389-EWH-RJK (E.D. Va.). Since the transfer, this court made multiple attempts to contact Plaintiff by mailing orders to two different addresses associated with him. *See* ECF Nos. 23, 26, 27. This matter is now before the court on the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), recommending dismissal of the action for failure to prosecute. [ECF No. 23.] The Report included a notice advising Plaintiff of his right to file objections and the consequences of failing to do so. *Id.* at 4. The Report was mailed to both known addresses for Plaintiff, but both mailings were returned as undeliverable. *See* ECF Nos. 26, 27.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this


court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Although the court has made multiple efforts to contact Plaintiff at his last known addresses, all such efforts have failed. Plaintiff has not updated either this court or the district court in the Eastern District of Virginia regarding his current address. Nor has he made any attempts to contact either court. Because Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the Report, the court reviews the Report for clear error.

After reviewing the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standards, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, ECF No. 23, and incorporates it by reference herein. This matter is **DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to prosecute**. Defendant’s motion to dismiss, ECF No. 9, is terminated. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail this order to both the Stonepointe Drive and Eastgate Drive addresses for Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 9, 2025
Columbia, South Carolina


Sherri A. Lydon
United States District Judge